

APPROACH TO SOLVE P VERSUS NP WITH CIRCULAR FOUNDED SET

KOBAYASHI, KOJI

1. OVERVIEW

This paper talk about that NP is not $AL=P$ by using circular founded set. I make set structure of CHAOS and computation history of Turing Machine. CHAOS is circular founded set and computation history of Turing Machine is well founded set. And Log space ATM can not compute CHAOS.

2. COMPUTATIONAL PROBLEM AS SET

In this paper, we think computational problem as set of related problems each other, and we analyze the structure of the set.

First, we define Turing Machine (TM) as set, and extend the structure to the whole computational problems.

Definition 1. I will use the term “DTM”, “NTM”, “ATM” as Deterministic TM, Nondeterministic TM, Alternating TM. And I will use the term “LSDTM”, “LSNTM”, “LSATM” to the TM limited log space. And I will use the term “PTDTM”, “PT-NTM”, “PTATM” to the TM limited polynomial time. And in this paper, TM is decider that does not have circular computation history.

Theorem 2. *We think the set which minimum elements is singleton include accepting configuration and empty set. Computation history of DTM is the singleton (or singleton of singleton), Computation history of NTM is the singleton of the set, Computation history of ATM is the set of the set. But depth of inclusion decide either universal state or existential state of the set. Universal state set include only existential state set, and Existential state set include only universal state set. And all computation history start universal state. All universal state set include no empty set.*

Proof. To think about the relation TM’s computation history and result. Because Computation history have no cyclic path in this paper, computation history is directed acyclic graph (DAG). This DAG have root as starting configuration, trunk as computing configuration, leaf as halting configuration. We can associate each TM’s result to the DAG of the computation history. Therefore, we can associate TM with set that correspond with the DAG of TM’s computation history. And the set is well-founded set which minimal elements are target configurations because DAG have no cyclic part. For simplicity, all computation history of this set are accepting computation history.

Computation history of DTM is only one path and have only one accepting configuration. Therefore, computation history correspond with singleton of the minimum elements.

Computation history NTM is DAG. But accepting configuration that included DAG affect to the NTM's result, and DAG structure does not affect to the NTM's result. Therefore, computation history correspond with set of the minimum elements.

Computation history of ATM is DAG. And DAG correspond with hypergraph that edge correspond with universal state and existential state. Therefore, computation history correspond with family of the set of the minimum elements. $\square$

Definition 3. I will use the term “*TM*” to the set of computation history that TM accept. And I will use the term “*DTM*”, “*NTM*”, “*ATM*”, “*LSDTM*”, “*LSNTM*”, “*LSATM*”, “*PTDTM*”, “*PTNTM*”, “*PTATM*” to the set of computation history that DTM, NTM, ATM, LSDTM, LSNTM, LSATM, PTDTM, PTNTM, PTATM accept.

Theorem 4. *TM is well founded set.*

Proof. It is trivial from the computation history of decider and I omit the proof. $\square$

Definition 5. I will use the term “*W : WORLD*” to the whole computational problems in this paper. I will use term $P \in W$ to the set of computational problems, and $p_i \in P$ to the index set of P . For simplicity, all set is finite set and Natural number (include 0) are finite number.

Depth of inclusion decide either universal state or existential state of the set. I will use the term “*U*” and “Universal state set” to the set that include all universal state set. I will use the term “*E*” and “Existential state set” to the set that include all existential state set. $\forall q \in p \in U (q \in E), \forall p \in q \in E (p \in U), W \subseteq U$, and $\forall q \in U (q \not\subseteq \emptyset)$.

As concrete problems, we defined even problem and satisfiability decision problem as a set.

Definition 6. I will use the term “*ODD*” to the all set of even cardinality.

$$\{p \mid |p| = 2k + 1, k \in N\} \in ODD$$

I will use the term “*CNF*” to the set of set that emulate the relation between CNF and truth value assignment by using membership of set.

$$p \rightarrow \{P \mid P \ni p\}$$

$$\bar{p} \rightarrow \{P \mid P \not\ni p\}$$

$$(A \vee B) \rightarrow (A \cup B) \neq \emptyset$$

$$(A \wedge B) \rightarrow (A \cap B) \neq \emptyset$$

And I will use the term “ C_t ” to the clause that the number of literal is t . I will use the term “ $C_{t,a}$ ” to C_t that added unique number in C_t .

To measuring the difference two sets, we define distance like hamming distance and introduce metric space.

Definition 7. I will use the term “ d ” as “distance of set” to the cardinality of symmetric difference.

$$d(A, B) = |A \Delta B| = |(A \cup B) \setminus (A \cap B)|$$

Give the distribution of computational problems on a metric space. Computational problem have fine granularity.

Theorem 8. $n = |\bigcup p|$. $\tilde{p}$ is the set of connected component of p . $|\tilde{p}|$ is the cardinality of $\tilde{p}$. There exist $|\tilde{p}| = O(2^n)$.

Proof. I give specific example using $ODD, \forall p, q \in P \in ODD (d(p, q) \geq 2)$, therefore P is totally disconnected. And P include half of power set of $\bigcup p$ and $|P| = O\left(\frac{2^{|\bigcup p|}}{2}\right) = O(2^n)$. Therefore, $|\tilde{p}| = |P| = O(2^n)$. $\square$

Theorem 9. $CNFODD = \{P \mid P = (CNF \ni Q \cap R \in ODD)\}$, $n = |\bigcup (p_i \in P \in CNFODD)|$, and $P_n : K(P_n) \leq O(n)$.

$\left| \widetilde{CNFODD} \right|$ is cardinality of all P_n , There holds $\left| \widetilde{CNFODD} \right| \geq O\left(\frac{n}{\lg(n)}\right)$.

Therefore, the number of variety of $CNFODD$ that can record in $O(n)$ size is $|CNFODD| \geq \left| \widetilde{CNFODD} \right| \geq O\left(\frac{n}{\lg(n)}\right)$.

Proof. Consider how to construct problems that have different cardinality of connected components. Mentioned above 8 $P \in ODD$ is totally disconnected, if $Q \subseteq P$ then $|\tilde{Q}| \neq |\tilde{P}|$. Therefore if $CNF \ni R \notin ODD$ then $Q = P \cap R$ and $|\tilde{P \cap R}| \neq |\tilde{P}|$.

Consider the amount of type of $|\tilde{P \cap R}|$ that C_t with $O(n)$ description can construct.

Start with $C_{n-m0}, 2^{m0} = 2$. $C_{n-m0} \ni p, q \rightarrow p \cap q = \emptyset$, therefore if $PC_{n-m0,k} = P \cap \left(\bigcap_{i=0}^k C_{n-m0,i}\right)$ then $PC_{n-m0,1}, PC_{n-m0,2}, PC_{n-m0,3}, \dots$ have different cardinality each other.

Description of $PC_{n-m0,k}$ is $O(n)$, therefore we can record this problem in $O(n)$ size. I will use the term $PC_{n-m0} = \{PC_{n-m0,1}, PC_{n-m0,2}, PC_{n-m0,3}, \dots\}$.

Next with $C_{n-m1}, m1 : \min(O(n) < 2^{m1})$. $C_{n-m1,0}$ can connect more disconnect component than $O(n)$ of C_{n-m0} . Therefore $|\tilde{PC_{m1}}| < |\tilde{P}| : P \in PC_{n-m0}$ and PC_{m1} is different any PC_{n-m0} . And we can construct $PC_{n-m1,1}, PC_{n-m1,2}, PC_{n-m1,3}, \dots$ same as C_{n-m0} .

We can construct PC_{mk} each $C_{n-m2}, m2 : \min(O(n^2) < 2^{m2})$, $C_{n-m3}, m3 : \min(O(n^3) < 2^{m3})$, $\dots$ totally $O\left(\frac{n}{\lg(n)}\right)$ times. And we can construct $O(n)$

each PC_{mk} . Therefore we can construct $O\left(\frac{n}{\lg(n)}\right)$ problems. That is $\left| \widetilde{CNFODD} \right| \geq O\left(\frac{n}{\lg(n)}\right)$. $\square$

Theorem 10. CNF in $O(n)$ size, Number of $F_a, F_b, F_c \in CNF$ of

$\forall F_a, F_b \exists F_c \left(|\tilde{F_a}| \neq |\tilde{F_b}| \rightarrow F_a \cap F_c \notin CNF \ni F_b \cap F_c \right)$
is at least $O\left(\frac{n}{\lg(n)}\right)$.

Proof. First, we think $F_a, F_b \in CNFODD \subset CNF$.

$$F_a = F_b \rightarrow |\widetilde{F_a}| = |\widetilde{F_b}| \leftrightarrow |\widetilde{F_a}| \neq |\widetilde{F_b}| \rightarrow F_a \neq F_b$$

$$F_a \neq F_b \rightarrow \exists V (F_a \not\supseteq V \in F_b)$$

$$\text{then } |\widetilde{F_a}| \neq |\widetilde{F_b}| \rightarrow \exists V (F_a \not\supseteq V \in F_b)$$

Second, we think $\{V\} = F_c \in \text{CNF}$. In CNF, it is exist that is true at single truth value assignment. And the truth value assignment be able to change to any value. These CNF size is $O(n)$ of the truth value assignment size n . Therefore, F_c is exist and it size is $O(n)$.

Therefore, $F_a \not\supseteq V \in F_b, F_c = \{V\} \rightarrow F_a \cap F_c = \emptyset, F_b \cap F_c = \{V\} \in \text{CNF}$.

And $|\text{CNFODD}| \geq |\widetilde{\widetilde{\text{CNFODD}}}| \geq O\left(\frac{n}{n^{\lg(n)}}\right)$ then number of F_a, F_b that's

intersection with F_c can not become equivalent is at least $O\left(\frac{n}{n^{\lg(n)}}\right)$. $\square$

Definition 11. I will use the term “Circular Founded Set” to the set with circular membership.

Theorem 12. *Circular founded set include the element that well founded set does not include.*

Proof. All element of well founded set can reach minimum element by following membership. But some element of circular foundation set can not. The element that can not reach minimum element is not same as any element of well founded set. Therefore, circular founded set include the element that well founded set does not include. $\square$

3. $NP \supsetneq AL = P$

Using the problem that's all part depends on whole, I show $NP \supsetneq AL = P$.

Definition 13. I will use the term “CHAOS” to the following problems.

$$\forall P \in \text{CHAOS} \forall p_i \in P ((p_i \in \text{CNFODD}) \wedge (\forall q \in p_i (q \subset P)) \wedge (\exists r (r \in p_i)))$$

I prove $NP \supsetneq AL$ by using CHAOS with $NP \supseteq \text{CHAOS}$ and $AL \not\supseteq \text{CHAOS}$.

Theorem 14. $AL \not\supseteq \text{CHAOS}$

Proof. We assume that $LSATM$ can compute the CHAOS. But the assumption contradict with CHAOS and we can see $AL \not\supseteq \text{CHAOS}$.

From assumptions, there is a log space reduction from CHAOS to LATM, and $LSATM$ include composite problem $LSATM$ and reduction from $CHAOS$. Hereafter, I will use the term “Composite Problem” to the problem that is composed of $LSATM$ and reduction from $CHAOS$. And I will use the term “ C ” to the set of computation history of the composite problems.

And as mentioned above 4, C is well formed. But $CHAOS$ has at least one self-similar structure with infinite recursion. Therefore $CHAOS \ni P \notin LSATM$ as mentioned above 12. If we want to treat P with well-formed structure, we must treat circular with spiral and verify the spiral that have same edges. Therefore, we must make spiral by changing $q \in p_i$ to $q?$ or $p_i \in q$ to $p_i?$, and we must verify equivalence $q?$ or $p_i?$.

Consider the case that $p_i \in q$ to $p_i?$. As mentioned above 10, combination number of $p_i?$ is $O\left(\frac{n}{n^{\lg(n)}}\right)$. Therefore in order to determine the equivalence of

$p_i?$ need to be able to distinguish each other. $O\left(\lg\left(\frac{n}{n^{\lg(n)}}\right)\right) = O(n)$ space is necessary to do so. But *LSATM* have only $O(\lg(n))$ space. Therefore, *LSATM* can not classify $p_i?$ and treat $p_i \in q$ as $p_i?$.

Consider the case that $q \in p_i$ to $q?$. Combination number of $q?$ is truth value assignment of p_i $O(2^n)$. Therefore in order to determine the equivalence of $q?$ need to be able to distinguish each other. $O(\lg(2^n)) = O(n)$ space is necessary to do so. But *LSATM* have only $O(\lg(n))$ space. Therefore, *LSATM* can not classify $q?$ and treat $q \in p_i$ as $q?$.

From the above, the assumption that *LSATM* can compute *CHAOS* contradict with *LSATM* space condition. Therefore, we can say from the reductio ad absurdum that *LSATM* can not compute *CHAOS*, and $AL \not\supseteq CHAOS$. $\square$

Theorem 15. $NP \supseteq CHAOS$

Proof. *PTNTM* have enough space to solve cycle of *CHAOS*. *PTNTM* can compute *CHAOS* to choose $q \in p_i$ to $q?$ in nondeterministic and check $\forall p_i \in P(q? \in p_i)$. And *PTNTM* use $O(n)$ time and $O(n)$ space to compute the choose and record $q?$ and compute $q? \in p_i \in P$. Therefore, $NP \supseteq CHAOS$. $\square$

Theorem 16. $NP \supsetneq AL$

Proof. $NP \supseteq CHAOS$, $AL \not\supseteq CHAOS$, and $NP \supset P = AL$, thus we see $NP \supsetneq AL = P$. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] KOBAYASHI Koji, NP is not AL and P is not NC is not NL is not L, 2011
- [2] Michael Sipser, (translation) OHTA Kazuo, TANAKA Keisuke, ABE Masayuki, UEDA Hiroki, FUJIOKA Atsushi, WATANABE Osamu, Introduction to the Theory of COMPUTATION Second Edition, 2008